

FINAL REPORT



NEVADA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION FEE


Prepared for the Nevada County Transportation Commission

by **PRISM Engineering, Grant P. Johnson, PTOE, PE**



Professional Traffic Operations
Engineer
(P.T.O.E.) in USA
Certificate No. PTOE0063
received May 1999




Professional Engineer in
California
Traffic Engineer (T.E.)
Certificate No. TR001453

DECEMBER 7, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Exhibit 1 Mitigation Fee Summary by Fee Area | 4 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| Methodology | 7 |
| Developer Fee Concept | 7 |
| Maintaining Satisfactory Levels of Service | 8 |
| Defining the Impacts | 8 |
| Developing Mitigations | 10 |
| Approving a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) List | 12 |
| Developing Cost Estimates | 13 |
| Allocating Costs, or Establishing a Nexus | 13 |
| Defining the Mitigation Fee(s) | 15 |
| AB 1600 Law | 16 |
| APPENDIX A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM LIST | 17 |
| APPENDIX B LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS | 19 |
| APPENDIX C AB 1600 Law: Mitigation Fee Act | 20 |
| APPENDIX D LAND USE DATA SET | 35 |



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The mitigation fee program developed for the western Nevada County jurisdictions has undergone various refinements over the past several years, as land use planning assumptions have changed. This document discusses the various changes that have taken place in Nevada County and Grass Valley and Nevada City land use planning assumptions, the associated capital improvement project needs, and the recommended mitigation fee program to finance the needed improvements.

The proposed mitigation fee needed to achieve satisfactory levels of service for traffic (LOS D or better), is set forth in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1

Mitigation Fee Summary by Fee Zone

| Fee Zone* | New Trips | Percent of Total | Allocated CIP Cost | Cost Per Trip |
|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| 2 | 607 | 0.70% | \$69,908 | \$115 |
| 3A | 149 | 0.10% | \$15,110 | \$101 |
| 3B | 366 | 1.00% | \$100,149 | \$273 |
| 4 | 207 | 0.40% | \$43,230 | \$209 |
| 5 | 1,439 | 2.00% | \$204,058 | \$142 |
| 6A | 1,811 | 1.40% | \$148,143 | \$82 |
| 6B | 2,867 | 6.30% | \$642,820 | \$224 |
| 7 | 5,314 | 5.90% | \$602,893 | \$113 |
| 8 | 15,932 | 82.10% | \$8,404,688 | \$527 |
| Totals | 28,693 | 100% | \$10,231,000 | |

If new development is charged the proposed mitigation fee shown in Exhibit 1 based on the Fee Zone geographical area assigned, it will be possible to adequately mitigate future traffic impacts from future development so that LOS D or better conditions can result. The mitigation fee schedule is based upon the pm peak hour, which is the analysis time period for the traffic model, and represents the "worst case" traffic period for Nevada County. The table prepared in Exhibit 1 is the culmination of numerous analyses and traffic model runs to determine the cost of traffic impacts from future planned development. The table represents the "Cost Per Trip" value for these impacts from new development in any one of the nine Fee Zones in western Nevada County. The dollar amount charged to new development is calculated by multiplying the appropriate Cost Per Trip, depending on the



Fee Zone geographical location, by the total number of pm peak hour trips anticipated by the development. The pm peak hour trip totals are typically calculated using the ITE Trip Generation Manual database of specific trip rates for numerous different types of land uses. The manual is industry standard, nation wide, and represents thousands of surveys or data collection to describe traffic volumes at the driveways of specific developments.

By way of example, to calculate the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) due for a new residential apartment complex in Fee Zone 5, the first step is to calculate the pm peak hour trip generation for the development. This is done by multiplying the appropriate pm peak hour trip generation rate by the size of the proposed development. In this example the size of the apartment complex is 280 units. The ITE trip rate for apartments is 0.6 trips per unit during the pm peak hour. The total trips for the pm peak hour would then be 0.6×280 , or 168 trips. The RTMF fee then is calculated by multiplying the value in Exhibit 1 for Fee Zone 5, or \$142/trip, by 168 trips: $\$142/\text{trip} \times 168 \text{ trips} = \$23,856$ due before permits for the apartment complex are issued. This RTMF procedure works for any type of land use, whether it be a gas station, amusement park, or government center. The pm peak hour trip generation best represents the true traffic impact of any development on the road system during the most critical time period. We have further refined this pm peak hour impact by using the NCTC's traffic model to determine to what extent traffic from each Fee Zone impacts the project locations included in the capital improvement program, for example: the Dorsey Drive new interchange, new signal installations at various intersections, etc.

The area which costs the most for new development is Fee Zone 8, at \$527/trip, which is to be expected, because this area is where most of the future improvements are needed, and the improvements serve the area. The new traffic facilities in Fee Zone 8 would be "used" mostly by Fee Zone 8 future development (based on a scientific traffic model assessment of trip assignments for all areas).



INTRODUCTION

This document describes the processes by which the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) developed a RTMF Program in cooperation with Nevada County, Grass Valley, and Nevada City. This program establishes a mitigation fee schedule with different fees due for each of nine Fee Zones, as defined in Exhibit 1 in the Executive Summary of this report. The fees collected from new development as a result of this program will provide the needed revenue to fund construction of future-development-induced mitigations to the regional system of roads, streets, and highways (excluding state or federal highways). These planned improvements are part of a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) jointly developed by all participating government agencies, which includes the list of projects as defined in Appendix A. These projects are what is needed to adequately mitigate future additional traffic impacts to LOS D or better conditions, on through the next 20 years. Although the collective planning efforts of the County, Grass Valley and Nevada City, and the NCTC have led to the creation of the current proposed CIP, the summary results are subject to change in the future as planning assumptions change. For example, there may be improvements identified or alluded to by the City of Grass Valley in its recent General Plan Update which may yet be included in the proposed RTMF program and CIP (i.e. the Empire Interchange improvements and/or Crestview Intersection / Interchange improvements / construction). Future updates of the RTMF program and CIP through planning studies would determine whether any new projects are added to or removed from the program. Level of service definitions are provided in Appendix B. Appendix A contains two tables, the original Table 1 which contains all of the improvements necessary to mitigate Year 2020 volumes to LOS D or better conditions, based on the 1980 Grass Valley General Plan and the 1995 Nevada County General Plan. Table 1 also identifies projects that were placed on substitute status from the program due to changes in land use projections based on economic analyses in the 1999 Grass Valley General Plan Update. This resulted in some locations being at LOS D or better conditions, or in other words, mitigation was no longer necessary. The column titled "Revised Year 2020" contains the level of service for the revised land use scenario, which is the land use data contained in Appendix D. Although costs were omitted for some projects, the project concepts have been retained in the program to provide for the possibility that development patterns would require improvements at those locations in lieu of other locations on the list. Table 2 in Appendix A reports the final modified RTMF program if the fee schedule is adjusted to account for cost sharing of the Dorsey Drive interchange \$12,300,000 cost. Forty seven percent of the traffic that would use the Dorsey Drive interchange would



come from new development, and the remaining portion could be paid for with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. Exhibit 1 has been updated from previous versions to reflect this reduction in local costs for the Dorsey Drive interchange. Although STIP funds are the most likely source of funding, the final approval to use STIP funds has not yet been made by the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC). The RTMF Program developed by the NCTC for western Nevada County is the result of more than five years of studying and defining impacts for a “moving target” of land use assumptions, growth rates, and political/economical climate. The optimistic land use assumptions for future growth assumed at the outset of study in the early 90’s has since been revised, in keeping with the economic studies of the Grass Valley and County general plans. The current configuration of land use quantities and improvements in the model represent the NCTC’s best efforts towards consensus between Grass Valley, Nevada City, and Nevada County of what could be expected to develop, overall, in the western Nevada County community during the next 20 years. The consensus efforts among Grass Valley, Nevada City, and Nevada County pertaining to land use quantities and development rates, have been accomplished through numerous meetings, presentations, and lively discussions which provided the necessary feedback to properly refine the CIP. In order to develop this program, the NCTC conducted a study process which has evolved over the years. Several large studies and various smaller work efforts relevant to the development of a CIP and RTMF have been completed to this end, including:

- 1994: Sub Regional Transportation Study
- 1995: Sub Area Traffic Studies for Alta Sierra, Lake of the Pines, and Lake Wildwood / Penn Valley
- 1995: West Slope Model Update (updated land use assumptions consistent with the Nevada County General Plan)
- 1997: Sub Regional Land Use Update for Urbanized Area (Fee Zone 8). The County and two Cities jointly fine-tuned Year 2015 land use assumptions within their jurisdictions.
- 1998: Using the NCTC’s traffic model, numerous model runs were set up to determine and capture relative traffic impacts to each of the projects in the CIP, from future development in each of the nine Fee Zone areas.
- 1998: Based on building activity, Nevada City revised land use projections in its City-limits. Grass Valley reviewed land use projections for proposed annexations of Loma Rica, Kenny Ranch, and Northstar. The traffic model was updated to determine the impact of these land use changes.
- 1999/2000: The model was updated with Grass Valley’s General Plan. It was determined that even though many changes were made to the City’s land use data, the resulting totals of new development remained about the same.
- 2000: Empire Interchange and SR 20 Corridor analyzed in detail



METHODOLOGY: GETTING TO THE ORDINANCE PHASE

There are several steps necessary to properly set up a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and RTMF for a geographical area, such as western Nevada County. These steps, which the NCTC followed, are summarized here and are elaborated in the pages that follow.

- Developer Fee Concept
- Maintaining Satisfactory Levels of Service
- Defining the Impacts
- Developing Mitigations
- Approving a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) List
- Developing Cost Estimates
- Allocating Costs, or Establishing a Nexus
- Defining the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee(s)

Developer Fee Concept

The essential elements of all such mitigation ordinances are findings that show that:

1. New development creates the need for improvements
2. A Nexus exists between a development project and the need for additional road improvements
3. The development will benefit from the improvements that it is funding
4. The fee only provides for new improvements
5. The new improvements can be translated into a cost per unit of new development (cost per trip)
6. The total of new revenue generated by all fees does not exceed 100% of the cost of the projects
7. The collected funds are segregated from general revenues, and earmarked to pay for specific improvements. The improvements are constructed within a reasonable time frame, and they directly and primarily benefit the users of the property on which the fees are imposed.

These seven essential elements must be present in the RTMF system which is to pass muster with the California State Mitigation Fee Act¹ law.

¹ The California Mitigation Fee Act (AB 1600) is discussed in more detail at the end of this section, and is referenced in specific Government Code SECTION 66000-66008 language in Appendix C



Maintaining Satisfactory Levels of Service

In order to maintain satisfactory traffic levels of service for a community, it is necessary to mitigate traffic impacts as they come on line due to future additional development. It is necessary to establish a system which can identify existing and future traffic impacts, and then provide for the mitigation of those impacts back to satisfactory levels of service as needed. Mitigations generally consist of capital improvements such as new roads, widening of roads, installation of traffic signals, bridges, interchanges, etc. The list of improvements needed to achieve satisfactory levels of service with future growth in traffic is called a Capital Improvement Program, or CIP.

Such a system can exist under California Mitigation Fee Act law, where future development can be held accountable to mitigate their "fair share" of future traffic impacts that degrade traffic levels of service below the acceptable standard. In the case of Nevada County, that established acceptable standard has been collectively set by the local public agencies to be Level of Service (LOS) D on a scale of LOS A through LOS F. LOS D is defined as follows:

LOS D:

is where a driver has an average delay at intersections of 35 to 55 seconds. It is the level at which roadway speeds begin to decline slightly with increasing flows. The driver experiences reduced physical and psychological comfort levels.

A complete chart of Level of Service definitions is found in Appendix B.

Defining the Impacts

The first step in defining impacts is to develop a tool that can project future traffic levels. Such a tool was developed for Nevada County in a sophisticated p.m. peak hour traffic model. The traffic model developed for the NCTC was a joint effort between the NCTC, Nevada County DOT and Planning Departments, the City of Grass Valley, the City of Nevada City, and Caltrans. All government agencies affected by decisions and conclusions based on this traffic model were given representation on various Technical Advisory Committees (TAC). At various stages of the development of these tools, the public was also given opportunity to respond and react to the conclusions coming out of the various studies which have led to the eventual Capital Improvement Program list.

The traffic model was calibrated to existing 1995 conditions using traffic count data and current land use totals for the same year. The calibration



process includes a validation process whereby all agencies “buy off” on the validity of the model, or after it passes a set of standards which have been defined by Caltrans in a document entitled Travel Forecasting Guidelines, 1992. The NCTC traffic model passed all tests defined by this document, and all participating public agencies, including Caltrans, approved of the final traffic model. The model was then used to forecast future traffic volumes by modifying the land use totals data file to represent the Year 2020 conditions, or a 20 year horizon. A 20 year horizon is typically the industry standard for what is called “future conditions” or the time period for which to develop long-term transportation plans. This is the future time for which a CIP is typically developed, and it was the case with Nevada County as well.

The traffic model was updated for the future conditions with land use planning assumptions obtained from the planning departments of Nevada County, the City of Grass Valley, and the City of Nevada City. Through joint meetings headed by the NCTC, the group of agencies was able to refine and rework the data until all parties could come to a general consensus of where future development would take place (such as in what city), and in what quantities. It is the final set of assumptions upon which this report and conclusions are based. The actual data files used in the NCTC traffic model can be found on the following Internet link:

<http://www.prismworld.com/REPORTS/nctc/AirQuality/MODEL%20files/models.htm>

The traffic model currently has over 379 traffic analysis zones (TAZs). Each TAZ has its own land use assumptions, feeding traffic onto a traffic network. The TAZ is a “micro-zone” geographical area determined during the initial set up and calibration of the traffic model. The TAZ boundary usually follows logical boundaries such as streets, rivers, property lines, etc.

There are three major steps in the modeling process:

- Trip Generation
 - The model calculates trips generated and attracted for each land use category for each TAZ. Trip generation is validated against actual traffic counts. The NCTC model is within a 4% overall error, which is well within the industry standard of up to 25% error.
- Trip Distribution
 - The model distributes the trips from each TAZ (based on the trip's purpose) to other destination TAZs. The average trip distances are known in the model, and can be adjusted to known measured values. We utilized the Caltrans Household Travel Survey data to calibrate trip distribution in the model. In that survey, over 700 Nevada County residents were queried as to their trip origin-destination characteristics.



- Trip Assignment
 - Trips are assigned along logical roadway paths based on shortest time from TAZ to TAZ. If congestion occurs, based on a capacity calculation, the model assigns remaining trips to the next shortest path. The model is congestion sensitive, and through several iterations, can reassign remaining traffic to alternative paths which are less congested.

The traffic model was used to develop future projected traffic volumes for each of the street segments and intersections within western Nevada County. The NCTC model was developed with a high level of detail, so that nearly every street, large and small, is included in the street network. Because of this, there is very little “interpretation” of traffic assignment necessary, since trip generation of each TAZ can be readily inspected for validity. All traffic model volumes were “post-process” analyzed in various state of the art traffic engineering analysis software packages. We utilized Highway Capacity Manual software programs such as HCS and Synchro Pro to determine level of service for critical intersections and street segments, especially as identified by local agency technical staff input.

Various documents were prepared, defining the results of analysis for numerous improvement alternatives, such as the Dorsey Drive interchange, or the Hughes Road interchange, or the Western Bypass, etc., to get some idea as to how these various improvements may benefit the transportation system. Where LOS D conditions were exceeded (LOS E or F conditions), these areas were identified and tabulated. The first document to make such analyses and definitions of impact in terms of level of service, was the Sub Regional Transportation Study, 1994, prepared for the NCTC. There were several other subsequent supplementary documents which further refined the data used in the RTMF development process, and these are listed at the end of the Introduction section of this report.

Developing Mitigations

In keeping with the Grass Valley and Nevada County General Plans, the criteria of LOS D or better conditions was established by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as the rule for determining where mitigations would be needed. LOS D was considered the worst, yet tolerable, traffic condition that could be allowed before traffic mitigation improvements would be necessary.

LOS D is the standard in many urbanized areas. If a particular road segment or a surface street intersection could not pass the “LOS D test” with future 20 year volumes loaded onto the street network, then the problem segment or intersection was placed on a list of “deficient” locations. This deficiency list was reviewed extensively by the TAC for various future



scenarios examined with the traffic model, and the finalized list was eventually used to decide where mitigations were needed.

In most cases, surface street widening (to add a lane, etc.) was possible, as well as the installation of a signal at an intersection to mitigate future volumes back to satisfactory levels of service. But in some cases, more creative solutions were needed such as the development of new roads into the transportation system, or the connection of other roads to better facilitate access to less congested facilities. This was necessary when the existing road system could not be significantly expanded or widened in place due to physical constraints, or when it could not be improved without causing significant and undesirable environmental impacts. It was also considered prohibitive if the improvement would be extremely costly (cost to benefit analysis, compared with alternatives).

For example, it was discovered in this study that the Idaho Maryland freeway ramp system was already near capacity, and a doubling of volumes through that "intersection" was not possible due to physical design constraints including width, length of freeway section, and topography. It was determined that a new parallel road facility was needed, in this case, the Dorsey Drive corridor connecting Brunswick Road with the SR 20 freeway system (with the construction of a new freeway interchange at the Dorsey Drive over-crossing). This "creative" improvement is an example of how mitigations become more regional in nature. Thus, the need for a RTMF program, to help finance the improvements that can really fix the projected transportation problems.

Several of the studies commissioned by the NCTC in relation to this process, developed highly detailed planning level improvement plans for "trouble spots" in the County. One of these was the 1996 Nevada County Operations Study which detailed improvements that could help short term traffic problems as well as long term capacity needs. Some of the mitigation plans that came out of that study included modern roundabouts for the McKnight interchange and downtown Grass Valley intersections, a coordinated signal system for Main Street in Grass Valley, a modified signal system and some ramp widening along the Brunswick corridor and SR 20 freeway over-crossing, etc.

More recently (June 2000), the NCTC has completed a comprehensive study for the Empire / SR 20 corridor, including the surface streets that interface with this corridor, and new mitigation plans are under consideration for inclusion into the RTMF program. The RTMF program is a dynamic and evolving mechanism, being updated on a regular basis with revised CIP projects, land use updates, and any modifications to City or County General Plans. It is the nature of planning solutions to constantly evolve with the



ever changing environment variables (i.e. national economy, state economy, environmental laws, technology changes, and even the advent of the Internet, etc.). All of these factors contribute to the fact that the system needs to be updated on a regular basis to be as consistent as possible with realistic assumptions for future growth.

Approving a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) List

Each City, the County, the NCTC, and Caltrans met together in numerous joint meetings over the past six years to discuss the results of various studies, and to offer input. It was the purpose of these TAC meetings to come to consensus as to which improvements were desirable for the County's transportation plan, or more specifically, for the regional CIP. This discussion and review process required determining which CIP projects were "regional" in nature. In other words, the County was not interested in funding what it considered a specific City project, and vice versa.

One of the several criteria that was used to determine if a project was regional in nature was whether the street was used by traffic that was considered regional, or multi-jurisdictional. A local residential street or cul-de-sac would never qualify, for instance, because it would generally be located within a city, or the county, but not both. But an arterial roadway within a City and/or the County would qualify if the road carried regional (longer distance) traffic such as commute traffic, deliveries, and if it was a road that was generally shared by residents of each City and the County. The County staff suggested that the following criteria be used to determine which projects should be included in the regional CIP:

- All ramp connections to freeways (SR 20/49) or expressways (SR 20) would be considered regional.
- Roads functionally classified as arterials and above. Intersections of arterials and above, with collectors and above, would qualify.
- Roads or intersections identified as providing regional circulation in the city or county general plans and their accompanying EIRs adopted after the passage of AB 1600 ordinance.

Since the Technical Advisory Committee had representation from each of the public agencies, it was possible to eliminate from the "wish list" those CIP projects which probably would not pass muster with a City Council or a Board of Supervisors (considered not acceptable to the local community). The remaining CIP list is now considered acceptable to all agencies, and is specifically defined in Appendix A. The Board of Supervisors and City Councils have agreed in concept to the CIP list of projects and resultant impact fees.

It should be noted that this list is a fluid list, meaning that it has been updated several times over the course of its development, and it is expected



to keep changing as land use assumptions and development rates change in the future. Because there is a degree of uncertainty in the location and scope of future development, the assumptions made by planners are constantly under revision and refinement.

Developing Cost Estimates

The Capital Improvement Program list shown in Appendix A contains cost estimates for each project identified. Some of these cost estimates are at the planning level, meaning that a formal Civil Engineering study has not taken place which would more precisely define specific costs. Even so, the cost estimates developed in the various NCTC work efforts have been reviewed by the TAC, and are considered conservative and completely appropriate for establishing a RTMF program. The TAC was very careful not to develop elaborate and expensive traffic mitigations, the CIP cost estimates represent a base-line cost. This CIP as currently constituted is really only a guideline and at best an educated guess as to what transportation circulation improvements will be needed in the future.

The CIP list contains a combination of cost estimates from planning level studies as well as formal civil engineering studies. For example, a Project Study Report was completed for the Dorsey Drive Interchange improvement in 1995, and the cost estimate of \$12,300,000 is accepted by the TAC with a high level of confidence due to the level of detail that was used in considering all potential costs. An important factor to consider in estimating cost is to ensure that sufficient funds to complete the improvement are available at the time that construction occurs. The cost estimates developed in this study are conservative, using industry standard estimates for generalized improvements (such as using \$150,000 as a general cost to install a signal, even though costs may vary somewhat from intersection to intersection).

Because we have used industry standard average costs to estimate various improvement costs, it is likely that the total fees needed will match the total fees collected in the program.

Allocating Costs, or Establishing a Nexus

It is a requirement of the Mitigation Fee Act law that a nexus between the impacts of future development and the improvements planned, must be shown. For example, it is not legal for a government agency to collect fees from future development to mitigate existing problems which have nothing to do with the development. It is not legal to allocate funds collected through a traffic mitigation fee program to projects that are not related to the road system, such as building a local library, a park, or some other City/County improvement not related to improving traffic levels of service.



Nor is it legal to collect fees from a development and use the fees to mitigate a problem unrelated to the development elsewhere in the jurisdiction, because there would be no "nexus" established. The nexus between traffic impacts and the improvements that mitigate those impacts must be shown.

The NCTC has endeavored to establish the nexus between the future traffic impacts and the mitigations that would improve levels of service back to acceptable LOS D or better levels, by using the NCTC traffic model as the tool to establish this link. The traffic model is a scientific and proven methodology for linking traffic impacts to development. The traffic model generates traffic from the various land uses, assigns the traffic to the road network, and keeps track of which roadway paths are used in each zone-to-zone assignment. It is a sophisticated "book-keeping" tool. Using the model, it is possible to determine the estimated trip generation from a specific development, where that traffic is expected to travel, and to what extent traffic volumes will increase on local roads. Using this information, it is possible to determine deficiencies, as well as mitigation needs / benefits correlated with specific development and its trip generation.

Several traffic modeling exercises were conducted to link the projects on the CIP list to traffic projections from future development. The NCTC traffic model is capable of identifying or summarizing the amount of traffic which would travel through any one of the CIP projects. For example, it was possible to identify how much traffic would travel through the proposed Dorsey Drive interchange. It was further possible to determine which TAZ's or Fee Zones this impacting traffic was coming from. By knowing where the future traffic was coming from, it was possible to assign a relative level of cost to various Fee Zones (as defined in Exhibit 1 of the Executive Summary), by taking the percentage of total traffic coming from each area and multiplying by the total cost for the improvement.

We developed a system that is even much more sophisticated than the norm, because it not only takes into consideration the distance traveled by trip generation from the various land use types, but it also takes into extensive consideration the geographical area from which the traffic originated.

There are nine of these Fee Zones (2,3A,3B,4,5,6A,6B,7,8), each of which have been assigned a portion of the total cost for improvements, and this assigned cost is based on true impact / use of the CIP improvements by traffic from each of the Fee Zone areas. By using the model to determine how much traffic from each of the Fee Zone areas impacted each of the CIP projects, it was possible to develop a RTMF that better represented "fair



share.” Many mitigation fee programs establish an area-wide fee, but have factors built in to adjust the fee based on a known set of trip distance averages for various types of development. We developed a system that is even much more sophisticated than the norm, because it not only takes into consideration the distance traveled by trip generation from the various land use types, but it also takes into extensive consideration the geographical area from which the traffic originated. This means that the RTMF developed in this study is sensitive to and highly interactive with the NCTC traffic model tool, which most accurately generates and distributes future traffic.

In the NCTC RTMF system, a developer will pay a traffic mitigation fee that is geared directly to the impacts that are expected from the development on the particular property in question. The system developed for the NCTC RTMF Program is sophisticated above the typical norm, because the fee is based upon true impacts to the CIP projects, and not a blanket fee. In this manner, developments and geographic sub-regions which have smaller impacts on the various regional improvements defined in the CIP are charged a lesser fee, not arbitrarily, but based on a scientific and sophisticated nexus established using the NCTC’s traffic model tool.

Defining the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee(s)

The mitigation fees developed by the NCTC for Nevada County, Grass Valley, and Nevada City, are defined in Exhibit 1 of the Executive Summary. The last column of that exhibit, Cost per Trip, shows the amount of money that is due from a development before permits are issued. The fee dollar amount is multiplied against the expected pm peak hour trip generation rate for that particular land use. This pm peak hour trip generation is not based on the general assumptions found in the NCTC traffic model, but is based on the specific land use categories and quantities for the development being proposed. The ITE Trip Generation Manual, 6th ed. is to be used to determine the most probable trip generation for the development. This readily available document defines for hundreds of different land use types, the trip generation that can be expected on a peak hour and daily basis.

The implementation of the final mitigation fees through a joint powers agreement helps assure that needed monies can be collected and saved in an account for this purpose. When the monies are sufficiently collected in this account, it is possible to finance the highest priority transportation improvement(s) on the CIP list. The decisions to spend the monies, and for which project(s), is also a consensus issue to be worked out by the community in which the fee was developed. This is usually the project that generates the most concern and interest at the time of available funding.



AB 1600 Law

This RTMF Ordinance is required to abide by the requirements of California law, which specifically addresses mitigation developer fees in Assembly Bill 1600, effective date January 1, 1989. That law requires any developer fee ordinance program to comply with the following rules:

- Identify the purpose of the fee.
- Identify the use for the fees and the specific facilities to be built.
- Determine a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
- Determine a reasonable relationship between the need for the facility and the development project.
- Determine a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facility to be built.
- Deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees according to Section 66006 of the Government Code.
- Make annual report identifying the purpose for any funds remaining in the account longer than five years, and demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it was charged.
- Refund to the current owner of record of the development project any unexpended or uncommitted funds plus interest for which a need cannot be demonstrated.

The RTMF Program established by the NCTC conforms to each of the requirements listed above. The Program is one that of necessity spans the jurisdictions of Nevada County, Grass Valley, and Nevada City within the western Nevada County region. There is some distinct advantage to getting all jurisdictions to participate jointly in this program, because of the ability to fund very large projects, which otherwise would not get built. The RTMF program provides for the mutual benefit of cooperating agencies because of the ability to mitigate roadway facilities that cross these jurisdictional boundaries at city limit lines, etc. Without such ordinances and program in place, it would be very difficult to establish any accountability for mitigation of such regional facilities. Leaving impacts unmitigated due to a lack of funding is detrimental everyone.



APPENDIX A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM LIST

Table 1 Capital Improvement Program Cost and LOS Summary

| node | PROJECTS Project Location Description (for LOS D) | Cost | Year 1995 | Original Year 2015 | Revised Year 2020 | Revised Year 2020 | Estimated Project Cost |
|---------|--|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | wo/CIP LOS | w/CIP LOS | wo/CIP LOS | w/CIP LOS | |
| | Projects Funded by All Zones | | | | | | |
| 558 | Bloomfield / SR 49 Signal | \$150,000 | E | B | A/F | D | \$150,000 |
| 1907 | Brunswick Rd / Dorsey Dr Signal & Widening | \$250,000 | B | B | D | D | Substitute Project ** |
| 386 | Brunswick to SR20 Modify Signal & Rechannel Onramp* | \$300,000 | E | C | E | D | \$300,000 |
| 678 | Brunswick Rd / Bennett Rd Signal & Widening | \$175,000 | B | A | D | D | Substitute Project ** |
| 478 | Brunswick / Old Tunnel Signal | \$200,000 | D | B | A/F | D | \$200,000 |
| 1014 | Dorsey Drive Interchange | \$12,300,000 | NA | D | NA | D | \$5,781,000 |
| 540 | E. Main St / Bennett St Realignment, Signal & Striping | \$1,500,000 | E | D | F | D | \$1,500,000 |
| 287-288 | Gold Flat Interchange Ramps Intersection Improvements | \$250,000 | D | B | C/E | B | \$250,000 |
| 283 | Idaho Maryland/E Main Ramps Intersection Improvements | \$350,000 | E | D | F | D | \$350,000 |
| | McCourtney 4 lanes from Mill to Old Auburn | \$250,000 | A | C | D | A | Substitute Project ** |
| 315 | McCourtney Rd Signal at SR 20 EB Ramp | \$250,000 | C | C | D | C | Substitute Project ** |
| | McKnight Dual Roundabout & Striping | \$300,000 | D | C | F | C | \$300,000 |
| 313 | Mill St / McCourtney Rd Signal | \$125,000 | D | D | F | D | \$125,000 |
| 539 | Mill St / Main St Coordinated Signal System | \$150,000 | B | C | B | B | Substitute Project ** |
| 314 | Mill St signal at SR 20 WB Ramp | \$150,000 | C | C | E | B | \$150,000 |
| 367 | Nevada City Hwy / Joerschke Signal | \$150,000 | B | B | A/F | B | \$150,000 |
| 538 | Rough & Ready Hwy / Ridge Rd Signal & Striping | \$125,000 | A | C | D | C | Substitute Project ** |
| 713 | S. Auburn St / Colfax Ave Intersection Improvements | \$500,000 | E | D | F | D | \$500,000 |
| 670 | S. Auburn St / Empire St Signal | \$125,000 | D | B | E | D | \$125,000 |
| 718 | Sutton Way / Dorsey Dr Signal & Widening | \$150,000 | B | D | D | B | Substitute Project ** |
| TSL 5 | W. Main /Church St Signal | \$150,000 | D | A | D | A | Substitute Project ** |
| 644 | Zion St / Ridge Road Intersection Improvements | \$150,000 | D | A | D | C | Substitute Project ** |
| | Total for Projects Funded by All Zones | \$18,050,000 | | | | | \$9,881,000 |
| | Projects Funded by Zone 8 | | | | | | |
| 666 | Brighton St / McCourtney Rd Signal & Widening | \$150,000 | A | C | B | A | Substitute Project ** |
| SL18 | McKnight Widening Freeman to Taylorville | \$350,000 | D | D | F | D | \$350,000 |
| 705 | Ophir / Bennett Signal & Striping | \$125,000 | B | D | D | C | Substitute Project ** |
| 541 | Ophir / Colfax Signal & Striping | \$125,000 | C | B | D | D | Substitute Project ** |
| | Total for Projects Funded by Zone 8 | \$750,000 | | | | | \$350,000 |
| | Total for All Projects | \$18,800,000 | | | | | \$10,231,000 |
| | 04/1998 Mitigation Fee | | | | 07/1999 Mitigation Fee | | |
| | Total trips = 63545 | | | | Total trips 60915 | | 100.00% |
| | New Trips = 31997 | | | | New Trips (from all zones) 28693 | | 47.10% |
| | | | | | New Zone 8 trips 15932 | | |

* See 1999 Brunswick Basin Traffic Operations Plan for detailed description.

**If development patterns create a need for these projects, they can be constructed using mitigation fees.



Table 2 Capital Improvement Program Cost and LOS Summary

| Table 2 Capital Improvement Program Cost and LOS Summary | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------|
| | | Year 1995 wo/CIP LOS | Original Year 2015 w/CIP LOS | Revised Year 2020 wo/CIP LOS | Revised Year 2020 w/CIP LOS | |
| node | PROJECTS Project Location Description (for LOS D) | | | | | |
| Projects Funded by All Zones | | | | | | |
| 658 | Bloomfield / SR 49 Signal | E | B | A/F | D | \$150,000 |
| 386 | Brunswick to SR20 Modify Signal & Rechannel Onramp* | E | C | E | D | \$300,000 |
| 478 | Brunswick / Old Tunnel Signal | D | B | A/F | B | \$200,000 |
| 1014 | Dorsey Drive Interchange | NA | D | NA | D | \$5,781,000 |
| 640 | E Main St / Bennett St Realignment, Signal & Striping | E | D | F | D | \$1,500,000 |
| 387-388 | Gold Flat Interchange Ramps Intersection Improvements | D | B | C/E | B | \$250,000 |
| 383 | Idaho Maryland/E Main Ramps Intersection Improvements | E | D | F | D | \$350,000 |
| 675-676 | McKnight Dual Roundabout & Striping | D | C | F | C | \$300,000 |
| 413 | Mill St / McCourtney Rd Signal | D | D | F | D | \$125,000 |
| 414 | Mill St signal at SR 20 WB Ramp | C | C | E | B | \$150,000 |
| 467 | Nevada City Hwy / Joerschke Signal | B | B | A/F | B | \$150,000 |
| 813 | S. Auburn St / Colfax Ave Intersection Improvements | E | D | F | D | \$500,000 |
| 770 | S. Auburn St / Empire St Signal | D | B | E | D | \$125,000 |
| | Total for Projects Funded by All Zones | | | | | \$9,881,000 |
| Projects Funded by Zone 8 | | | | | | |
| 831-1925 | McKnight Widening Freeman to Taylorville | D | D | F | D | \$350,000 |
| | Total for Projects Funded by Zone 8 | | | | | \$350,000 |
| Total for All Projects | | | | | | \$10,231,000 |
| 04/1998 MITIGATION FEE | | | 07/1999 MITIGATION FEE | | | |
| Total trips = 63545 | | | Total trips = 60915 | | | |
| New trips = 31997 | | | New trips (from all zones) | | 28693 | |
| | | | New Zone 8 trips | | 15932 | |

* See 1999 Brunswick Basin Traffic Operations Plan for detailed description.



APPENDIX B LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS

LOS A describes free-flow operations. Free-flow speeds prevail. Vehicles are almost completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Even at the maximum density for LOS A, the average spacing between vehicles is about 530 ft, or 26 car lengths, which affords the motorist a high level of physical and psychological comfort. The effects of incidents or point breakdowns are easily absorbed at this level.

LOS B represents reasonably free flow, and free-flow speeds are maintained. The lowest average spacing between vehicles is about 330 ft, or 17 car lengths. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted, and the general level of physical and psychological comfort provided to drivers is still high. The effects of minor incidents and point breakdowns are still easily absorbed.

LOS C provides for flow with speeds at or near the free-flow speed of the freeway. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably restricted at LOS C, and lane changes require more care and vigilance on the part of the driver. Minimum average spacings are in the range of 220 ft, or 11 car lengths. Minor incidents may still be absorbed, but the local deterioration in service will be substantial. Queues may be expected to form behind any significant blockage.

LOS D is the level at which speeds begin to decline slightly with increasing flows. In this range, density begins to increase somewhat more quickly with increasing flow. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is more noticeably limited, and the driver experiences reduced physical and psychological comfort levels. Even minor incidents can be expected to create queuing, because the traffic stream has little space to absorb disruptions. Minimum average vehicle spacings are about 165 ft, or eight car lengths.

LOS E describes operation at capacity. Operations at this level are volatile, there being virtually no usable gaps in the traffic stream. Vehicles are spaced at approximately six car lengths, leaving little room to maneuver within the traffic stream at speeds that are still over 49 mph. Any disruption to the traffic stream, such as vehicles entering from a ramp or a vehicle changing lanes, can establish a disruption wave that propagates throughout the upstream traffic flow. At capacity, the traffic stream has no ability to dissipate even the most minor disruptions, and any incident can be expected to produce a serious breakdown with extensive queuing. Maneuverability within the traffic stream is extremely limited, and the level of physical and psychological comfort afforded the driver is poor.

LOS F describes breakdowns in vehicular flow. Such conditions generally exist within queues forming behind breakdown points. Such breakdowns occur for a number of reasons: Traffic incidents cause a temporary reduction in the capacity of a short segment, so that the number of vehicles arriving at the point is greater than the number of vehicles that can move through it.

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 1997, Chapter 3, II Methodology, Page 3-9



APPENDIX C

Source: The Planning and Zoning Law found at <http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/pzd/1997/>

California Government Code Sections 66000 - 66009

Chapter 5. Fees for Development Projects

66000. As used in this chapter:

(a) "Development project" means any project undertaken for the purpose of development. "Development project" includes a project involving the issuance of a permit for construction or reconstruction, but not a permit to operate.

(b) "Fee" means a monetary exaction other than a tax or special assessment, whether established for a broad class of projects by legislation of general applicability or imposed on a specific project on an ad hoc basis, *** that is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project, but does not include fees specified in Section 66477, fees for processing applications for governmental regulatory actions or approvals, fees collected under development agreements adopted pursuant to Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 65864) of Chapter 4, or fees collected pursuant to agreements with redevelopment agencies which provide for the redevelopment of property in furtherance or for the benefit of a redevelopment project for which a redevelopment plan has been adopted pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law (Part 1 (commencing with Section 33000) of Division 24 of the Health and Safety Code.

(c) "Local agency" means a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, school district, special district, authority, agency, any other municipal public corporation or district, or other political subdivision of the state.

(d) "Public facilities" includes public improvements, public services and community amenities.

(Added by Stats. 1987, Ch. 927; Amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418; Amended by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572; Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 549.)

66000.5. This chapter, Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 66010), Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 66012), Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 66016), and Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 66020) shall be known and may be cited as the Mitigation Fee Act.

(Added by Stats. 1996, Ch. 799.)

66001. (a) In any action establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency on or after January 1, 1989, the local agency shall do all of the following:

(1) Identify the purpose of the fee.

(2) Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Sections 65403 or 66002, may be made in



applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged.

(3) Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

(4) Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

(b) In any action imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency on or after January 1, 1989, the local agency shall determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

(c) Upon receipt of a fee subject to this section, the local agency shall deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees pursuant to Section 66006.

(d) For the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit into the account or fund, and every five years thereafter, the local agency shall make all of the following findings *** with respect to *** that portion of the *** account or fund remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted: ***

(1) Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put. ***

(2) Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it *** is charged.

(3) Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a).

(4) Designate the approximate dates on which the funding referred to in paragraph (3) is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.

When findings are required by this subdivision, they shall be made in connection with the public information required by subdivision (b) of Section 66006. The findings required by this subdivision need only be made for moneys in the possession of the local agency, and need not be made with respect to letters of credit, bonds, or other instruments taken to secure payment of the fee at a future date. If the findings are not made as required by this subdivision, the local agency shall refund the moneys in the account or fund as provided in subdivision (e).

(e) Except as provided in subdivision (f), when sufficient funds have been collected, as determined pursuant to subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 66006, to complete financing on incomplete public improvements identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), and the public improvements remain incomplete, the local agency shall identify, within 180 days of the determination that sufficient funds have been collected, an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will be commenced, or shall refund to the then current record owner or owners of the lots or units, as identified on the last equalized assessment roll, *** of the development project or projects on a prorated basis, the unexpended *** portion of the fee, and any interest accrued thereon***. By means consistent with the intent of this section, a local agency may refund the unexpended *** revenues by direct payment, by providing a temporary suspension of fees, or by any other reasonable means ***. The determination by the governing body of



the local agency of the means by which those revenues are to be refunded is a legislative act.

(f) If the administrative costs of refunding unexpended *** revenues pursuant to subdivision (e) exceed the amount to be refunded, the local agency, after a public hearing, notice of which has been published pursuant to Section 6061 and posted in three prominent places within the area of the development project, may determine that the revenues shall be allocated for some other purpose for which fees are collected subject to this chapter and which serves the project on which the fee was originally imposed.

(Added by Stats. 1987, Ch. 927; Amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418; Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 569.)

66002. (a) Any local agency which levies a fee subject to Section 66001 may adopt a capital improvement plan, which shall indicate the approximate location, size, time of availability, and estimates of cost for all facilities or improvements to be financed with the fees.

(b) The capital improvement plan shall be adopted by, and shall be annually updated by, a resolution of the governing body of the local agency adopted at a noticed public hearing. Notice of the hearing shall be given pursuant to Section 65090. In addition, mailed notice shall be given to any city or county which may be significantly affected by the capital improvement plan. This notice shall be given no later than the date the local agency notices the public hearing pursuant to Section 65090. The information in the notice shall be not less than the information contained in the notice of public hearing and shall be given by first-class mail or personal delivery.

(c) "Facility" or "improvement," as used in this section, means any of the following:

(1) Public buildings, including schools and related facilities; provided that school facilities shall not be included if Senate Bill 97 of the 1987-88 Regular Session is enacted and becomes effective on or before January 1, 1988.

(2) Facilities for the storage, treatment, and distribution of nonagricultural water.

(3) Facilities for the collection, treatment, reclamation, and disposal of sewage.

(4) Facilities for the collection and disposal of storm waters and for flood control purposes.

(5) Facilities for the generation of electricity and the distribution of gas and electricity.

(6) Transportation and transit facilities, including but not limited to streets and supporting improvements, roads, overpasses, bridges, harbors, ports, airports, and related facilities.

(7) Parks and recreation facilities.

(8) Any other capital project identified in the capital facilities plan adopted pursuant to Section 66002.

(Added by Stats. 1987, Ch. 927.)

66003. Sections 66001 and 66002 do not apply to a fee imposed pursuant to a reimbursement agreement by and between a local agency and a property owner or developer for that portion of the cost of a public facility paid by the property owner or



developer which exceeds the need for the public facility attributable to and reasonably related to the developments. This chapter shall become operative on January 1, 1989.

(Added by Stats. 1987, Ch. 927; Amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418; Amended by Stats. 1989, Ch. 170.)

66004. The establishment or increase of any fee pursuant to this chapter shall be subject to the requirements of Section 66018.

(Added by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418; Amended by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66005. (a) When a local agency imposes any fee or exaction as a condition of approval of a proposed development, as defined by Section 65927, or development project, as defined by Section 65928, those fees or exactions shall not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service or facility for which the fee or exaction is imposed.

(b) This section does not apply to fees or monetary exactions expressly authorized to be imposed under Sections 66475.1 and 66477.

(c) It is the intent of the Legislature in adding this section to codify existing constitutional and decisional law with respect to the imposition of development fees and monetary exactions on developments by local agencies. This section is declaratory of existing law and shall not be construed or interpreted as creating new law or as modifying or changing existing law.

(Added by Stats. 1986, Ch. 1203, Formerly 65959, Renumbered and Amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418.)

66006. (a) If a local agency requires the payment of a fee specified in subdivision (c) in connection with the approval of a development project, the local agency receiving the fee shall deposit it with the other fees for the improvement in a separate capital facilities account or fund in a manner to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the local agency, except for temporary investments, and expend those fees solely for the purpose for which the fee was collected. Any interest income earned by moneys in the capital facilities account or fund shall also be deposited in that account or fund and shall be expended only for the purpose for which the fee was originally collected.

(b) (1) For each separate account or fund established pursuant to subdivision (a), the local agency shall, within *** 180 days *** after the last day of each fiscal year, make available to the public the *** following information for the fiscal year:

(A) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund.

(B) The amount of the fee.

(C) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.

(D) The amount of the fees collected and the interest earned.

(E) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.



(F) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement, as identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 66001, and the public improvement remains incomplete.

(G) A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, and in the case of an interfund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the account or fund will receive on the loan.

(H) The amount of refunds made pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 66001 and any allocations pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 66001 ***.

(2) The local agency shall review the information made available to the public pursuant to paragraph (1) at the next regularly scheduled public meeting not less than 15 days after this information is made available to the public, as required by this subdivision. Notice of the time and place of the meeting, including the address where this information may be reviewed, shall be mailed, at least 15 days prior to the meeting, to any interested party who files a written request with the local agency for mailed notice of the meeting. Any written request for mailed notices shall be valid for one year from the date on which it is filed unless a renewal request is filed. Renewal requests for mailed notices shall be filed on or before April 1 of each year. The legislative body may establish a reasonable annual charge for sending notices based on the estimated cost of providing the service.

(c) For purposes of this section, "fee" means any fee imposed to provide for an improvement to be constructed to serve a development project, or which is a fee for public improvements within the meaning of subdivision (b) of Section 66000, and that is imposed by the local agency as a condition of approving the development project.

(d) Any person may request an audit of any local agency fee or charge that is subject to Section 66023, including fees or charges of school districts, in accordance with that section.

(e) The Legislature finds and declares that untimely or improper allocation of development fees hinders economic growth and is, therefore, a matter of statewide interest and concern. It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature that *** this section shall supersede all conflicting local laws and shall apply in charter cities.

(f) At the time the local agency imposes a fee for public improvements on a specific development project, it shall identify the public improvement that the fee will be used to finance.

(Added by Stats. 1983, Ch. 921; Amended by Stats. 1987, Ch. 1002; Formerly 53077, Amended and Renumbered by Stats. 1988, Ch. 418; Amended by Stats. 1989, Ch. 170; Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 169; Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 569.)

66006.5. (a) A city or county which imposes an assessment, fee, or charge, other than a tax, for transportation purposes may, by ordinance, prescribe conditions and procedures allowing real property which is needed by the city or county for local transportation purposes, or by the state for transportation projects which will not receive any federal funds, to be donated by the obligor in satisfaction or partial satisfaction of the assessment, fee, or charge.



(b) To facilitate the implementation of subdivision (a), the Department of Transportation shall do all of the following:

(1) Give priority to the refinement, modification, and enhancement of procedures and policies dealing with right-of-way donations in order to encourage and facilitate those donations.

(2) Reduce or simplify paperwork requirements involving right-of-way procurement.

(3) Increase communication and education efforts as a means to solicit and encourage voluntary right-of-way donations.

(4) Enhance communication and coordination with local public entities through agreements of understanding that address state acceptance of right-of-way donations.

(Added by Stats. 1989, Ch. 857.)

Note: Stats. 1989 Ch. 857 also reads:

Sec. 1. (a) The Legislature makes the following findings and declarations:

(1) Numerous areas throughout the state are experiencing rapid expansion of residential, commercial, industrial, and business activities, which is producing increased traffic levels.

(2) Many property owners have expressed a willingness to donate real property or property rights for transportation improvements to accommodate these increases in traffic.

(3) The cost of right-of-way acquisition is often a significant and, in some cases, even a prohibitive cost element in many transportation improvement projects.

(4) The voluntary donation of right-of-way can result in direct benefits to property owners, developers and the community at large, and can greatly assist in reducing the costs associated with transportation improvement projects.

(5) It is in the best interest and welfare of the citizens of California for the state and counties and cities to actively foster donations of right-of-way for transportation purposes.

(b) It is the intention of the Legislature, through the enactment of this act, to encourage and facilitate donations of right-of-way by willing donors in all areas where transportation improvements are to be made.

66007. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subdivision (b), any local agency which imposes any fees or charges on a residential development for the construction of public improvements or facilities shall not require the payment of those fees or charges, notwithstanding any other provision of law, until the date of the final inspection, or the date the certificate of occupancy is issued, whichever occurs first. However, utility service fees may be collected at the time an application for utility service is received. If the residential development contains more than one dwelling, the local agency may determine whether the fees or charges shall be paid on a pro rata basis for each dwelling when it receives its final inspection or certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first; on a pro rata basis when a certain percentage of the dwellings have received their final inspection or certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first; or on a lump-sum basis when the first dwelling in the development receives its final inspection or certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first.



(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the local agency may require the payment of those fees or charges at an earlier time if (1) the local agency determines that the fees or charges will be collected for public improvements or facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated and for which the local agency has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan prior to final inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy or (2) the fees or charges are to reimburse the local agency for expenditures previously made. "Appropriated," as used in this subdivision, means authorization by the governing body of the local agency for which the fee is collected to make expenditures and incur obligations for specific purposes.

(c) (1) If any fee or charge specified in subdivision (a) is not fully paid prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of any portion of the residential development encumbered thereby, the local agency issuing the building permit may require the property owner, or lessee if the lessee's interest appears of record, as a condition of issuance of the building permit, to execute a contract to pay the fee or charge, or applicable portion thereof, within the time specified in subdivision (a). If the fee or charge is prorated pursuant to subdivision (a), the obligation under the contract shall be similarly prorated.

(2) The obligation to pay the fee or charge shall inure to the benefit of, and be enforceable by, the local agency that imposed the fee or charge, regardless of whether it is a party to the contract. The contract shall contain a legal description of the property affected, shall be recorded in the office of the county recorder of the county and, from the date of recordation, shall constitute a lien for the payment of the fee or charge, which shall be enforceable against successors in interest to the property owner or lessee at the time of issuance of the building permit. The contract shall be recorded in the grantor-grantee index in the name of the public agency issuing the building permit as grantee and in the name of the property owner or lessee as grantor. The local agency shall record a release of the obligation, containing a legal description of the property, in the event the obligation is paid in full, or a partial release in the event the fee or charge is prorated pursuant to subdivision (a).

(3) The contract may require the property owner or lessee to provide appropriate notification of the opening of any escrow for the sale of the property for which the building permit was issued and to provide in the escrow instructions that the fee or charge be paid to the local agency imposing the same from the sale proceeds in escrow prior to disbursing proceeds to the seller.

(d) This section applies only to fees collected by a local agency to fund the construction of public improvements or facilities. It does not apply to fees collected to cover the cost of code enforcement or inspection services, or to other fees collected to pay for the cost of enforcement of local ordinances or state law.

(e) "Final inspection" or "certificate of occupancy," as used in this section, have the same meaning as described in Sections 305 and 307 of the Uniform Building Code, International Conference of Building Officials, 1985 Edition.

(f) Methods of complying with the requirement in subdivision (b) that a proposed construction schedule or plan be adopted, include, but are not limited to, (1) the adoption of the capital improvement plan described in Section 66002, or (2) the submittal of a five-year plan for construction and rehabilitation of school facilities pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 17717.5 of the Education Code.



(Added by Stats. 1986, Ch. 685; Amended by Stats. 1987, Ch. 1184; Formerly 53077.5, Amended and Renumbered by Stats. 1988, Ch. 912; Amended by Stats. 1989, Ch. 1217; Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 231.)

66008. A local agency shall expend a fee for public improvements, as accounted for pursuant to Section 66006, solely and exclusively for the purpose or purposes, as identified in subdivision (f) of Section 66006, for which the fee was collected. The fee shall not be levied, collected, or imposed for general revenue purposes.

(Added by Stats. 1996, Ch. 569.)

66009. (Repealed by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

California Government Code Sections 66010 - 66011

Chapter 6. Fees for Development Projects Reconstructed After a Natural Disaster

66010. As used in this chapter:

(a) "Development project" means a development project as defined in Section 66000.

(b) "Fee" means a monetary exaction or a dedication, other than a tax or special assessment, which is required by a local agency of the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project, but does not include fees for processing applications for governmental regulatory actions or approvals.

(c) "Local agency" means a local agency, as defined in Section 66000.

(d) "Public facilities" means public facilities, as defined in Section 66000.

(e) "Reconstruction" means the reconstruction of the real property, or portion thereof, where the property after reconstruction is substantially equivalent to the property prior to damage or destruction.

(Amended by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66011. No fee may be applied by a local agency to the reconstruction of any residential, commercial, or industrial development project that is damaged or destroyed as a result of a natural disaster, as declared by the Governor. Any reconstruction of real property, or portion thereof, which is not substantially equivalent to the damaged or destroyed property, shall be deemed to be new construction and only that portion which exceeds substantially equivalent construction may be assessed a fee. The term substantially equivalent, as used in this section, shall have the same meaning as the term in subdivision (c) of Section 70 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(Added by Stats. 1988, Ch. 162.)

California Government Code Sections 66012 - 66014

Chapter 7. Fees for Specific Purposes



60012. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law which prescribes an amount or otherwise limits the amount of a fee or charge which may be levied by a city, county, or city and county, a city, county, or city and county shall have the authority to levy any fee or charge in connection with the operation of an aerial tramway within its jurisdiction.

(b) If any person disputes whether a fee or charge levied pursuant to subdivision (a) is reasonable, the auditor, or if there is no auditor, the fiscal officer, of the city, county, or city and county shall, upon request of the legislative body of the city, county, or city and county, conduct a study and determine whether the fee or charge is reasonable.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66013. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a local agency imposes fees for water connections or sewer connections, or imposes capacity charges, those fees or charges shall not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee or charge is imposed, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee or charge imposed in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two-thirds of those electors voting on the issue.

(b) As used in this section:

(1) "Sewer connection" means the connection of a building to a public sewer system.

(2) "Water connection" means the connection of a building to a public water system, as defined in subdivision *** (f) of Section *** 116275 of the Health and Safety Code.

(3) "Capacity charges" means charges for facilities in existence at the time the charge is imposed or charges for new facilities to be constructed in the future *** that are of benefit to the person or property being charged.

(4) "Local agency" means a local agency as defined in Section 66000.

(c) Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the ordinance, resolution, or motion imposing a fee or capacity charge subject to this section shall be brought pursuant to Section 66022.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572; Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 1023. Effective September 29, 1996.)

66014. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a local agency charges fees for zoning variances; zoning changes; use permits; building inspections; building permits; filing and processing applications and petitions filed with the local agency formation commission or conducting preliminary proceedings or proceedings under the Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985, Division 3 (commencing with Section 56000) of Title 5; the processing of maps under the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act, Division 2 (commencing with Section 66410) of Title 7; or planning services under the authority of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 65100) of Division 1 of Title 7 or under any other authority; those fees shall not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee charged in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two-third of those electors voting on the issue.



(b) Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the ordinance, resolution, or motion authorizing the charge of a fee subject to this section shall be brought pursuant to Section 66022.

(Added by Stats. 1990; Ch. 1572.)

California Government Code Sections 66016 - 66018.5

Chapter 8. Procedures for Adopting Various Fees

66016. (a) Prior to levying a new fee or service charge, or prior to approving an increase in an existing fee or service charge, a local agency shall hold at least one open and public meeting, at which oral or written presentations can be made, as part of a regularly scheduled meeting. Notice of the time and place of the meeting, including a general explanation of the matter to be considered, and a statement that the data required by this section is available, shall be mailed at least 14 days prior to the meeting to any interested party who files a written request with the local agency for mailed notice of the meeting on new or increased fees or service charges. Any written request for mailed notices shall be valid for one year from the date on which it is filed unless a renewal request is filed. Renewal requests for mailed notices shall be filed on or before April 1 of each year. The legislative body may establish a reasonable annual charge for sending notices based on the estimated cost of providing the service. At least 10 days prior to the meeting, the local agency shall make available to the public data indicating the amount of cost, or estimated cost, required to provide the service for which the fee or service charge is levied and the revenue sources anticipated to provide the service, including General Fund revenues. Unless there has been voter approval, as prescribed by Section 66013 or 66014, no local agency shall levy a new fee or service charge or increase an existing fee or service charge to an amount which exceeds the estimated amount required to provide the service for which the fee or service charge is levied. If, however, the fees or service charges create revenues in excess of actual cost, those revenues shall be used to reduce the fee or service charge creating the excess.

(b) Any action by a local agency to levy a new fee or service charge or to approve an increase in an existing fee or service charge shall be taken only by ordinance or resolution. The legislative body of a local agency shall not delegate the authority to adopt a new fee or service charge, or to increase a fee or service charge.

(c) Any costs incurred by a local agency in conducting the meeting or meetings required pursuant to subdivision (a) may be recovered from fees charged for the services which were the subject of the meeting.

(d) This section shall apply only to fees and charges as described in Sections 51287, 56383, 57004, 65104, 65456, 65863.7, 65909.5, 66013, 66014, and 66451.2 of this code, Sections 17951, 19132.3, and 19852 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 41901 of the Public Resources Code, and Section 21671.5 of the Public Utilities Code.

(e) Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the ordinance, resolution, or motion levying a fee or service charge subject to this section shall be brought pursuant to Section 66022.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572. Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 487; Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 487; Amended by Stats. 1995, Ch. 657, and Stats. 1995, Ch. 686. Effective on



October 10, 1995.)

66017. (a) Any action adopting a fee or charge, or increasing a fee or charge adopted, upon a development project, as defined in Section 66000, which applies to the filing, accepting, reviewing, approving, or issuing of an application, permit, or entitlement to use shall be enacted in accordance with the notice and public hearing procedures specified in Section 54986 or 66016 and shall be effective no sooner than 60 days following the final action on the adopting of the fee or charge or increase in the fee or charge.

(b) Without following the procedure otherwise required for the adoption of a fee or charge, or increasing a fee or charge, the legislative body of a local agency may adopt an urgency measure as an interim authorization for a fee or charge, or increase in a fee or charge, to protect the public health, welfare and safety. The interim authorization shall require four-fifths vote of the legislative body for adoption. The interim authorization shall have no force or effect 30 days after its adoption. The interim authority shall contain findings describing the current and immediate threat to the public health, welfare and safety. After notice and public hearing to Section 54986 or 66016, the legislative body may extend the interim authority for an additional 30 days. Not more than two extensions may be granted. Any extension shall also require a four-fifths vote of the legislative body.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66018. (a) Prior to adopting an ordinance, resolution, or other legislative enactment adopting a new fee or approving an increase in an existing fee to which this section applies, a local agency shall hold a public hearing, at which oral or written presentation can be made, as part of a regularly scheduled meeting. Notice of the time and place of the meeting, including a general explanation of the matter to be considered, shall be published in accordance with Section 6062a.

(b) Any costs incurred by a local agency in conducting the hearing required pursuant to subdivision (a) may be recovered as part of the fees which were the subject of the hearing.

(c) This section applies only to the adopting or increasing of fees to which a specific statutory notice requirement, other than Section 94594.2, does not apply.

(d) As used in this section, "fees" do not include rates or charges for water, sewer, or electrical service.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66018.5. "Local agency" as used in this chapter, has the same meaning as provided in Section 66000.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)



California Government Code Sections 66020 - 66025

Chapter 9. Protests, Legal Actions, and Audits

66020. (a) Any party may protest the imposition of any fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed on a *** development project, as defined in Section 66000, by a local agency by meeting both of the following requirements:

(1) Tendering any required payment in full or providing satisfactory evidence of arrangements to pay the fee when due or ensure performance of the conditions necessary to meet the requirements of the imposition.

(2) Serving written notice on the governing body of the entity, which notice shall contain all of the following information:

(A) A statement that the required payment is tendered or will be tendered when due, or that any conditions which have been imposed are provided for or satisfied, under protest.

(B) A statement informing the governing body of the factual elements of the dispute and the legal theory forming the basis for the protest.

(b) Compliance by any party with subdivision (a) shall not be the basis for a local agency to withhold approval of any map, plan, permit, zone change, license, or other form of permission, or concurrence, whether discretionary, ministerial, or otherwise, incident to, or necessary for, the *** development project. This section does not limit the ability of a local agency to ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of law in determining whether or not to approve or disapprove a development project.

(c) Where a reviewing local agency makes proper and valid findings that the construction of certain public improvements or facilities, the need for which is directly attributable to the proposed residential housing development, is required for reasons related to the public health, safety, and welfare, and elects to impose a requirement for construction of those improvements or facilities as a condition of approval of the proposed development, then in the event a protest is lodged pursuant to this section, that approval shall be suspended pending withdrawal of the protest, the expiration of the limitation period of subdivision (d) without the filing of an action, or resolution of any action filed. This subdivision confers no new or independent authority for imposing fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions not presently governed by other law.

(d) (1) A protest filed pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be filed at the time of approval or conditional approval of the development or within 90 days after the date of the imposition of the fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions to be imposed on a *** development project. Each local agency shall provide to the project applicant a notice in writing at the time of the approval of the project or at the time of the imposition of the fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions, a statement of the amount of the fees or a description of the dedications, reservations, or other exactions, and notification that the 90-day approval period in which the applicant may protest has begun.

(2) Any party who files a protest pursuant to subdivision (a) may file an action to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the imposition of the fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed on a *** development project by a local agency within 180 days after the *** delivery of the notice.. Thereafter, notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, all persons are barred from any action or proceeding or any defense of invalidity



or unreasonableness of the imposition. Any proceeding brought pursuant to this subdivision shall take precedence over all matters of the calendar of the court except criminal, probate, eminent domain, forcible entry, and unlawful detainer proceedings.

(e) If the court finds in favor of the plaintiff in any action or proceeding brought pursuant to subdivision (d), the court shall direct the local agency to refund the unlawful portion of the payment, with interest at the rate of 8 percent per annum, or return the unlawful portion of the exaction imposed.

(f) (1) If the court grants a judgment to a plaintiff invalidating, as enacted, all or a portion of an ordinance or resolution enacting a fee, dedication, reservation, or other exaction, the court shall direct the local agency to refund the unlawful portion of the payment, plus interest at an annual rate equal to the average rate accrued by the Pooled Money Investment Account during the time elapsed since the payment occurred, or to return the unlawful portion of the exaction imposed.

(2) If an action is filed within 120 days of the date at which an ordinance or resolution to establish or modify a fee, dedication, reservation, or other exactions to be imposed on a *** development project takes effect, the portion of the payment or exaction invalidated shall also be returned to any other person who, under protest pursuant to this section and under that invalid portion of that same ordinance or resolution as enacted, tendered the payment or provided for or satisfied the exaction during the period from 90 days prior to the date of the filing of the action which invalidates the payment or exaction to the date of the entry of the judgment referenced in paragraph (1).

(g) Approval or conditional approval of a development occurs, for the purposes of this section, when the tentative map, tentative parcel map, or parcel map is approved or conditionally approved or when the parcel map is recorded if a tentative map or tentative parcel map is not required.

(h) The imposition of fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions occurs, for the purposes of this section, when they are imposed or levied on a specific development.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.; Amended by Stats. 1992, Ch. 605; Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 549.)

66021. (a) Any party on whom a fee, tax, assessment, dedication, reservation, or other exaction has been imposed, the payment or performance of which is required to obtain governmental approval of a development, as defined by Section 65927, or development project, may protest, as provided in Sections 66020 and 66475.4, the establishment or imposition of the fee, tax, assessment, dedication, reservation, or other exaction. If a party files a protest under both Sections 66020 and 66475.4, Section 66475.4 shall prevail over Section 66020 to the extent of any conflict between those two sections.

(b) The protest procedures of subdivision (a) do not apply to the protest of any tax or assessment (1) levied pursuant to a principal act which contains protest procedures, or (2) that is pledged to secure payment of the principal of, or interest on, bonds or other public indebtedness.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66022. (a) Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul an ordinance, resolution, or motion adopting a new fee or service charge, or modifying or



amending an existing fee or service charge, adopted by a local agency, as defined in Section 66000, shall be commenced within 120 days of the effective date of the ordinance, resolution, or motion.

If an ordinance, resolution, or motion provides for an automatic adjustment in a fee or service charge, and the automatic adjustment results in an increase in the amount of a fee or service charge, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the increase shall be commenced within 120 days of the effective date of the increase.

(b) Any action by a local agency or interested person under this section shall be brought pursuant to Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 860) of Title 10 of Part 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

(c) This section shall apply only to fees, capacity charges, and service charges described in and subject to Sections 66013 and 66014.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66023. (a) Any person may request an audit in order to determine whether any fee or charge levied by a local agency exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of any product or service provided by the local agency. If a person makes that request, the legislative body of the local agency may retain an independent auditor to conduct an audit to determine whether the fee or charge is reasonable.

(b) Any costs incurred by a local agency in having an audit conducted by an independent auditor pursuant to subdivision (a) may be recovered from the person who requests the audit.

(c) Any audit conducted by an independent auditor to determine whether a fee or charge levied by a local agency exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of providing the product or service shall conform to generally accepted auditing standards.

(d) The procedures specified in this section shall be alternative and in addition to those specified in Section 54985.

(e) The Legislature finds and declares that oversight of local agency fees is a matter of statewide interest and concern. It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature that this chapter shall supersede all conflicting local laws and shall apply in charter cities.

(f) This section shall not be construed as granting any additional authority to any local agency to levy any fee or charge which is not otherwise authorized by another provision of law, nor shall its provisions be construed as granting authority to any local agency to levy a new fee or charge when other provisions of law specifically prohibit the levy of a fee or charge.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66024. (a) In any judicial action or proceeding to validate, attack, review, set aside, void, or annul any ordinance or resolution providing for the imposition of a development fee by any city, county, or district in which there is at issue whether the development fee is special tax within the meaning of Section 50076, the city, county, or district has the burden of producing evidence to establish that the development fee does not exceed the cost of the service, facility, or regulatory activity for which it is imposed.



(b) No party may initiate any action or proceeding pursuant to subdivision (a) unless both of the following requirements are met:

(1) The development fee was directly imposed on the party as a condition of project approval.

(2) At least 30 days prior to initiating the action or proceeding, the party request the city, county, or district to provide a copy of the documents which establish that the development fee does not exceed the cost of the service, facility, or regulatory activity for which it is imposed. In accordance with Section 6257, the city, county, or district may charge a fee for copying the documents requested pursuant to this paragraph.

(c) For purposes of this section, costs shall be determined in accordance with fundamental fairness and consistency of method as to the allocation of costs, expenses, revenues, and other items included in the calculation.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)

66025. "Local agency," as used in this chapter, means a local agency as defined in Section 66000.

(Added by Stats. 1990, Ch. 1572.)



APPENDIX D

LAND USE DATA SET

The following table summarizes the land use quantities used in the NCTC traffic model for future conditions. The zones are sorted by TAZ number, but also indicate the Fee Zone in which the particular TAZ resides. This table is divided into 16 columns, the right-most 13 columns containing specific land use data either in dwelling units (for Type 1 "production" land uses), or in acreages (for Type 2 "attraction" land uses). It must be noted that in Type 2 land uses, the acreages are high by a factor of 10 so that fractions of an acre can be accounted for in the integer value. For example, 22 is actually 2.2 acres in the Type 2 land uses.

A legend of the land use column definitions is given in the following table:

Table A-1, Land Use Data Set Definitions

| Type | Column Heading | Land Use Description | PM Trips / Unit |
|------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 101 | Normal Population | 0.13 / person |
| 1 | 102 | Low income Population | 0.09 / person |
| 1 | 103 | R1 Single Family Residential | 0.9 / unit |
| 1 | 104 | R2 Multiple Family Residential | 0.6 / unit |
| 1 | 105 | RR Rural Residential | 0.6 / unit |
| 1 | 106 | AF Low Density residential | 0.8 / unit |
| 1 | 107 | Retirement normal income | 0.4 / unit |
| 1 | 108 | Retirement low income | 0.3 / unit |
| | | | |
| 2 | 201 | Commercial | 22.0 / acre |
| 2 | 202 | Industrial | 6.6 / acre |
| 2 | 203 | EC Employment Center | 14.3 / acre |
| 2 | 204 | GB Tourist Commercial | 8.0 / acre |
| 2 | 205 | LB C1 Community Business District | 3.3 / acre |
| 2 | 206 | LI Light Industrial, M1/M2 | 11.0 / acre |
| 2 | 207 | OP Office Professional | 19.5 / acre |
| 2 | 208 | P Public / Government | 11.0 / acre |
| 2 | 209 | SL Service Lodging | 0.35 / acre |
| 2 | 210 | School | 6.0 / acre |
| 2 | 211 | C2 High Commercial | 27.0 / acre |
| 2 | 212 | Park | 0.45 / acre |
| 2 | 213 | Church | 5.5 / acre |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6A | 1 | 1 | | | | | 82 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 2 | | | | | 231 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 3 | | | | | 190 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 4 | | | | | 173 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 5 | | | | | 108 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 6 | | | | | 126 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 7 | | | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 8 | | | | | 245 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 9 | | | | | 102 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 10 | | | | | 112 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 11 | | | | | 126 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 12 | | | | | 199 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 13 | | | | | 222 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 14 | | | | | 296 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 15 | | | | | 204 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 16 | | | | | 161 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 17 | | | | | 337 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 18 | | | 181 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 19 | | | | | 44 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 20 | | | | | 166 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 25 | | | | | 443 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 29 | | | | | 216 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 30 | | | | | 131 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 31 | | | | | 555 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 32 | | | | | 284 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 33 | | | | | 128 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 34 | | | | | 173 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 35 | | | | | 315 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 36 | | | | | 55 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 37 | | | | | 244 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 38 | | | | | 439 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 39 | | | | | 385 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 41 | | | 100 | | 72 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 42 | | | | | 93 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 43 | | | | | 331 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 44 | | | | | 218 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 45 | | | | | 106 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 46 | | | 267 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 49 | | | | | 98 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 50 | | | | | 298 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 52 | | | 68 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 53 | | | | | 312 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 53 | | | | | 91 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 54 | | | | | 306 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 56 | | | | | 41 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 57 | | | | | 205 | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6B | 1 | 58 | | | | | 108 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 59 | | | | | 151 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 60 | | | | | 253 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 61 | | | | | 68 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 62 | | | | | 106 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 63 | | | | | 162 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 64 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 65 | | | | | 234 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 66 | | | | | 143 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 67 | | | | | 448 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 68 | | | 79 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 69 | | | 31 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 70 | | | | | 600 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 71 | | | | | 123 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 72 | | | 247 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 73 | | | 12 | | | | | 80 | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 74 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 76 | | | 37 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 77 | | | 76 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 78 | | | | | | | 66 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 80 | | | 410 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 81 | | | 184 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 82 | | | | | 179 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 83 | | | | | 1459 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 84 | | | | | 355 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 85 | | | 14 | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3A | 1 | 86 | | | | | 226 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 87 | | | 60 | 76 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 88 | | | 322 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 89 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 90 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 91 | | | 70 | 130 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 91 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 92 | | | 234 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 94 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 95 | | | 141 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 96 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 97 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 98 | | | 154 | | 35 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 99 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 100 | | | 76 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 101 | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 102 | | | 149 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 103 | | | 8 | 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 104 | | | 97 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 105 | | | 252 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 106 | | | 95 | | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | 1 | 107 | | | 570 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 108 | | | 31 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 110 | | | | | | 189 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 111 | | | | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 112 | | | 85 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 113 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 114 | | | 37 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 115 | | | 71 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 116 | | | 120 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 117 | | | | | 129 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 118 | | | | | 334 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 119 | | | | | 94 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 120 | | | 101 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 121 | | | | | 103 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 122 | | | | | 159 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 123 | | | | | 169 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 124 | | | | | 62 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 125 | | | | | 159 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 126 | | | | | 265 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 127 | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 128 | | | 46 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 129 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 130 | | | 13 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 131 | | | | | 32 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 132 | | | | | 164 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 133 | | | 597 | | 235 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 135 | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 136 | | | 39 | 115 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 137 | | | | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 138 | | | 49 | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 139 | | | 9 | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 140 | | | 124 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 141 | | | 42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 142 | | | 26 | 94 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 143 | | | 14 | 47 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 144 | | | 78 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 145 | | | 35 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 146 | | | 172 | 43 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 147 | | | | | 31 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 148 | | | | | 150 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 149 | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 151 | | | 39 | 92 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 152 | | | 73 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 153 | | | 107 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 155 | | | 33 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 156 | | | 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 158 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 161 | | | | 159 | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | 1 | 162 | | | 38 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 163 | | | 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 164 | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 165 | | | | 253 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 166 | | | | 156 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 167 | | | | 50 | 142 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 168 | | | 1 | 120 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 169 | | | 58 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 170 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 171 | | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 172 | | | 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 173 | | | 23 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 174 | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 175 | | | 199 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 176 | | | 150 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 177 | | | | | 532 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 178 | | | | | 227 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 179 | | | | | 282 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 180 | | | | | 151 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 181 | | | | | 158 | | | | | | | | |
| 3A | 1 | 182 | | | | | 166 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 183 | | | 26 | 16 | 206 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 184 | | | | | 144 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 185 | | | | | 334 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 186 | | | | | 115 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 187 | | | | | 134 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 188 | | | | | 83 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 189 | | | | | 280 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 190 | | | | | 65 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 191 | | | | | 144 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 192 | | | | | 191 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 193 | | | | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 194 | | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 195 | | | | | 94 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 196 | | | | | 339 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 197 | | | | | 36 | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 1 | 198 | | | | | 394 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | 199 | | | | | 201 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 201 | | | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 203 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 208 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 209 | | | 28 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 210 | | | 95 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 211 | | | 74 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 212 | | | 69 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 213 | | | 63 | 40 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 214 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 215 | | | 114 | | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | 1 | 216 | | | 93 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 217 | | | 110 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 218 | | | 75 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 219 | | | 230 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 220 | | | 161 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 221 | | | 72 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 222 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 223 | | | 95 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 224 | | | 30 | 60 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 225 | | | | 110 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 226 | | | 70 | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 229 | | | 48 | 20 | 104 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 230 | | | 83 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 231 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 232 | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 233 | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 234 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 235 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 236 | | | 42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 237 | | | 130 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 238 | | | 96 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 240 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 241 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 242 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 248 | | | | 72 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 264 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 265 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 266 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 267 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 268 | | | 81 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 269 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 270 | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 281 | | | 121 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 282 | | | 164 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 283 | | | 27 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 284 | | | 94 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 285 | | | 158 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 286 | | | 195 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 287 | | | 137 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 288 | | | 49 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 289 | | | 89 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 290 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 291 | | | 55 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 292 | | | 30 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 293 | | | 204 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 294 | | | 33 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 295 | | | 212 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 296 | | | 90 | | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6B | 1 | 297 | | | 1 | 32 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 298 | | | 19 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 299 | | | 20 | 55 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 300 | | | 164 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 301 | | | 326 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 302 | | | 33 | | | | 30 | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 303 | | | 9 | | | | | 105 | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 304 | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 305 | | | 127 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 306 | | | 127 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 307 | | | 273 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 308 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 309 | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 310 | | | 38 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 311 | | | 37 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 312 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 313 | | | 58 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 314 | | | 23 | | | | | 234 | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 315 | | | 81 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 316 | | | 128 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 317 | | | 268 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 318 | | | 85 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 319 | | | 52 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 320 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 321 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 322 | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 323 | | | 29 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 324 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 325 | | | 71 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 1 | 326 | | | 22 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 330 | | | 81 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 331 | | | 17 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 332 | | | 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 333 | | | 1603 | | 228 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 334 | | | 1630 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 335 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 336 | | | 50 | | 46 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 337 | | | 176 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 338 | | | 7 | | 114 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 339 | | | 191 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 340 | | | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 341 | | | 86 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 342 | | | 4 | | | | | 131 | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 343 | | | 103 | 92 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 344 | | | 74 | 66 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 345 | | | 39 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 346 | | | 99 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 347 | | | 25 | | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee Zone | Type | TAZ | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 7 | 1 | 348 | | | 62 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 349 | | | 18 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 350 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 351 | | | 171 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 352 | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 353 | | | 257 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 360 | | | 22 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 361 | | | 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 362 | | | 39 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 362 | | | | | 26 | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 363 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 364 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 365 | | | 240 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 366 | | | 251 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 367 | | | 2009 | 37 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 368 | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 369 | | | 5 | 160 | | | | 23 | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 370 | | | 61 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 371 | | | 8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 372 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 373 | | | 44 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 374 | | | 111 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 1 | 375 | | | 67 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



| Fee ZONE | TYPE | TAZ | 201 | 202 | 203 | 204 | 205 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 211 | 212 | 213 |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 6A | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | 120 | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 8 | | | | | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 18 | | | | | 16 | | 6 | | | | | | 4 |
| 6B | 2 | 20 | 47 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 27 | | | | | | 105 | 80 | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1876 | |
| 7 | 2 | 32 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 35 | | | | | | | | | | 94 | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 39 | | | | | 15 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 43 | | | | | 13 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 46 | | | | | | | | | | | | 500 | |
| 6B | 2 | 50 | | | | | | | 127 | | | | | 750 | |
| 8 | 2 | 52 | | | | | 7 | | | | | 94 | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 53 | | 0 | | | | 137 | | | | 50 | | | |
| 5 | 2 | 62 | | | | | | | | | | 50 | | | |
| 5 | 2 | 63 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 64 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| 5 | 2 | 67 | | | | | 34 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | 764 | |
| 8 | 2 | 72 | | 4 | | | 36 | | 21 | | | | 93 | | 7 |
| 8 | 2 | 73 | 24 | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 75 | | | | | | 0 | | | | | 339 | 368 | |
| 8 | 2 | 76 | | | | | | 25 | 16 | | | | 52 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 78 | | | | | | | 20 | | | | 263 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 79 | | | | | | | | | | | 44 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 80 | | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | 124 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 82 | | 80 | | | | | | | | | 21 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 81 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 83 | | | | | | | 21 | | | | | | |
| 5 | 2 | 84 | | | | | | 1008 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 85 | | | | | | | 7 | | | | 56 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 86 | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 35 |
| 8 | 2 | 90 | 52 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 91 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 81 |
| 8 | 2 | 92 | | | | | | | | | | 30 | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 94 | 141 | 653 | | | | | 4 | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 95 | | | 30 | | 90 | 497 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 96 | | | | | | 147 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 97 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 98 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 102 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 103 | | 270 | 36 | | | 0 | | | | | | | 50 |



| Fee ZONE | TYPE | TAZ | 201 | 202 | 203 | 204 | 205 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 211 | 212 | 213 |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 8 | 2 | 104 | 137 | | | | 0 | | 40 | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 105 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 107 | 0 | | | 34 | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 106 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 85 |
| 8 | 2 | 108 | | | | | | | 204 | | | | 100 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 112 | | | | | | | | | | | 100 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 115 | | | | | | | | | | | | 139 | 36 |
| 8 | 2 | 116 | 0 | | | | 9 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 127 | | | | | | | 17 | 36 | | | 93 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 128 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 29 |
| 8 | 2 | 129 | | | 0 | | | | | | | 509 | | 30 | |
| 8 | 2 | 130 | | | | | | | 62 | | | | 24 | 523 | |
| 3B | 2 | 131 | | | | | | | | | 270 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 133 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 134 | | | 270 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 135 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 139 | | | | 230 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 141 | | | | | | | | | 10 | 45 | 10 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 142 | | | | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 143 | | | | | 250 | | 24 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 144 | | | | | 20 | | 50 | | 25 | 260 | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 145 | | 20 | | | | 50 | | | 50 | | | 100 | 50 |
| 8 | 2 | 146 | | | | | 108 | | | 100 | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 148 | | | | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 149 | | 200 | 150 | | | 160 | | | | | | 230 | |
| 8 | 2 | 150 | | | | | 40 | 20 | | 10 | 50 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 151 | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | 170 | |
| 8 | 2 | 153 | | | 30 | | | | | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| 8 | 2 | 154 | | | | | | | | 50 | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 155 | | | | | 60 | | | | 30 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 156 | | | | | 0 | | 5 | | | 632 | | | 40 |
| 8 | 2 | 158 | 186 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 159 | 74 | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 160 | 145 | | | | | | 24 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 161 | 81 | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 162 | | | | | 38 | | 113 | 126 | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 163 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | 109 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 164 | 94 | | | | | 331 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 165 | 126 | | | | | | 15 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 166 | 128 | | | | | 49 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 167 | | | | | | | | | | | | 29 | |
| 8 | 2 | 168 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 169 | | | | | | | | | | | 98 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 170 | | | | | | 39 | 15 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 171 | 84 | | | | | | 14 | | | | | 5 | |
| 8 | 2 | 172 | | | | | | 0 | | | | | 3 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 173 | | | | | | | | | | | 169 | | |



| Fee ZONE | TYPE | TAZ | 201 | 202 | 203 | 204 | 205 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 211 | 212 | 213 |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 8 | 2 | 174 | 176 | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 176 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | 2 | 185 | | | | | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | 189 | | | 37 | | 19 | 20 | 10 | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | 191 | | | | | | | 13 | | | | | | |
| 3B | 2 | 198 | | | | | | | | | | | | 987 | |
| 8 | 2 | 200 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 202 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 204 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 206 | | | | | | | 3 | | | | 116 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 207 | | | | | | | 11 | | | | 115 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 208 | 103 | 35 | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 209 | | 0 | | | 35 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 210 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 211 | 2 | | | | 0 | | 9 | | | 67 | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 212 | | | | | 5 | | 17 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 213 | 61 | | | | | | 4 | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13 |
| 8 | 2 | 216 | 1 | | | | | | | 19 | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 218 | | | | | | | | | | | 33 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 219 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| 8 | 2 | 220 | | 2 | | | | | 5 | | | 45 | 18 | | 17 |
| 8 | 2 | 222 | | | | | | | 6 | | | | 4 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 223 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | 25 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 224 | | | | | | | 13 | | | | 14 | 4 | |
| 8 | 2 | 225 | 17 | | | | | 35 | | | | | | 121 | |
| 8 | 2 | 226 | | | | | | | 13 | | | | 38 | 91 | |
| 8 | 2 | 227 | | | | | | | 7 | | 69 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 228 | 10 | | | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 229 | | 175 | 275 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 230 | | | | 110 | | | 20 | 40 | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 234 | | | | | | | | 30 | 15 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 235 | | | | 30 | | | 25 | 10 | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 236 | | | | | | | | | 23 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 237 | 40 | | | | | | | | 100 | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 238 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| 8 | 2 | 239 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 240 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 241 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 242 | 71 | | 0 | | | 362 | 307 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 245 | | | | | | 325 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 246 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 247 | | | | | | | | | | | 253 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 249 | | | 0 | | | 40 | 40 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 251 | | | | | | | 35 | | | | 10 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 253 | | | | | | | 50 | | | | 0 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 254 | | | | | | | | | | | 50 | | |



| Fee ZONE | TYPE | TAZ | 201 | 202 | 203 | 204 | 205 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 211 | 212 | 213 |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 8 | 2 | 255 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 256 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 257 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 258 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 259 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 260 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 261 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 262 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 263 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 290 | | | | | | | | | | 87 | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 297 | | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 299 | | | 50 | | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 303 | 65 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 304 | 150 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 309 | 50 | | | | 10 | | | 4 | 15 | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 316 | 21 | | | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 318 | 20 | | | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| 6B | 2 | 319 | | | 280 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 331 | | | | | | | | | | 94 | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 333 | | | | | | | | | | 149 | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 336 | 107 | | | | | | 116 | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 338 | | | | | 159 | 129 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 340 | | | | | | 190 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 341 | 30 | 51 | | | | | 45 | 58 | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 342 | 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 343 | 90 | | | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 344 | | | 70 | | | 50 | 30 | | | 202 | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 352 | | | | | | | | | | | | 594 | |
| 6A | 2 | 360 | | 90 | | 126 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 2 | 361 | | | | | | | 60 | 41 | | | | | |
| 6A | 2 | 362 | 95 | | | | | 150 | 5 | | | | | | |
| 6A | 2 | 366 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2000 | |
| 6A | 2 | 368 | 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6A | 2 | 371 | | | | | 46 | 50 | 20 | | | | | | |
| 6A | 2 | 372 | | | | | | 80 | | | | 834 | | 40 | |

